

III. REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 9 and 18 have been amended, and claims 4, 11 and 20 have been canceled. As a result, claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-20 and 21-26 remain pending in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office. The present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent application that claim(s) priority to the instant application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Guo et. al. (US Pub. No. 2005/0120121), hereinafter “Guo,” in view of Paulo *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0198790), hereafter “Paulo,” and further in view of Yu (U.S. Patent No. 6,983,278), hereafter “Yu.” Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over “Guo” in view of Paulo and Yu and further in view of Marks (US 6,876,977), hereinafter “Marks”.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Guo in view of Paulo and Yu and/or Marks as a secondary reference, Applicants assert that the cited references, considered individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

In addition to previously submitted arguments, Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, that the set of back end systems have a plurality of back-end

systems each contains a particular type of item and communicates with a supplier having the type of item, at least one of the set of back end systems having a type of item that differs from the type of item of another of the set of back end systems. In contrast, Yu, although teaching multiple suppliers, does not teach or suggest a plurality of back end systems that each contains a particular type of item and communicates with a supplier having the type of item, one of which is selected based on the item type, at least one of the set of back end systems having a type of item that differs from the type of item of another of the set of back end systems. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With still further respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 16, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest that both the request and the second request are received via a unitary system for requesting items of different types, that the unitary system makes a determination whether the second item is the same type of item as the first item and only includes the second item in the request with the first item if they are of the same type. The Office states that it is old and well known to expect similar products from the same vendor. However, Applicants respectfully object to the Office's use of Official Notice, especially in light of the fact that both requests are made via a system that is designed to receive requests for items of different types. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With further respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 16, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest selecting a back-end system from the set of back-end systems for processing the request, wherein the back-end system is selected based on the type of item of the first item and the location setting within a profile corresponding to the requestor. In contrast, the stores in the passages of Guo cited by the Office are not selected based on the type of item. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 3, 2009

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

/Hunter E. Webb/
Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593